



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,787	11/14/2001	Mark A. Kirkpatrick	60027.0074US01	8852
39262	7590	04/18/2007	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD BELLSOUTH CORPORATION P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			NAWAZ, ASAD M	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2155		

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/993,787	KIRKPATRICK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Asad M. Nawaz	2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-18 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-18 and 20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ . 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the RCE filed 1/22/07. Claims 1, 8, and 14 have been amended. Claim 19 has been canceled. No other claims have been added, amended, or canceled. Claims 1-20 remain pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 and 20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-18 and 20 recites the limitation "the one or more field names of the form" in the independent claims. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Nelson et al (US Patent No. 5,999,948) hereinafter referred to as Nelson further in view of Getchius et al (USPN: 6496843).

As to claim 1, Nelson teaches a method for presenting forms and publishing form data, said method comprising: maintaining a field engine table, said table comprising data identifying one or more fields of a form. (Abstract; col 3, lines 17-24; col 4, lines 25-39)

Receiving a request for a network resource including said form; (col 3, lines 25-36)

In response to said request, determining whether a previously compiled class file should be utilized to respond to said request (col 5, lines 34-64; col 8, lines 1-12)

In response to determining that a previously compiled class file should not be utilized to respond to said request, creating an executable class file configured to generating markup language for displaying the fields of the form in a web browser. (col 5, lines 1-9 and 34-64; col 7, lines 46-67; col 8, lines 1-12)

Wherein one or more field names are identical to corresponding fields in the form and the one or more field names are associated with a corresponding response data of the form, wherein a software component is not hard-coded with the one or more field names (col 8, lines 1-16 ; examiner notes that only one field name needs to be identical to a corresponding field for the limitations to be met. Furthermore, it is not specified whether the software component recited is responsible for a specific function. It appears as if a random software component would suffice);

Generating markup language by executing said class file and returning said markup language as a response to said request for a network resource. (col 3, lines 25-36; col 5, lines 34-64)

However, Nelson does not explicitly indicate utilizing the field engine table to retrieve the one or more field names of the form.

Getchius teaches utilizing the field engine table to retrieve the one or more filed names of the form (col 52, lines 31-64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Getchius et al into those of Nelson in order to make the system efficient. By storing and retrieving field names from an engine table allows all field and table names to be merged into a single master data structure.

As to claim 2, Nelson teaches the method of claim 1, wherein determining whether a previously compiled class file should be utilized comprises determining whether said request for said network resource was a first request for said network resource. (col 7, lines 46-60; col 8, lines 1-12)

As to claim 3, Nelson teaches the method of claim 1, wherein determining whether a previously compiled class file should be utilized comprises determining whether said request for said network resource was a first request for said network resource or whether a web server operative to provide said network resource was reset since the last time said network resource was accessed. (col 7, lines 46-60; col 8, lines 1-12)

As to claim 4, Nelson teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said field engine

table further comprises data indicating a data type for each of said fields. (col 4, lines 25-39; col 6, lines 44-46)

As to claim 5, Nelson teaches the method of claim 4, wherein said field engine table further comprises a form name and a version number corresponding to each of said fields (col 3, lines 8-12; col 8, lines 57-61)

As to claim 6, Nelson teaches the method of claim 5, wherein the said field engine table further comprises field names for each of said fields of said form and wherein the said field names are associated with each of said fields by said class file.(col 3, lines 25-36; col 4, lines 25-39; col 8, lines 1-12)

As to claim 7, Nelson teaches the method of claim 6, further comprising receiving a request to publish response data associated with each of said field names;(col 5, lines 36-64)

And storing said response data associated with each of said field names in an output table having fields with names identical to said field names.(col 8, lines 57-61; col 13, lines 3-17)

Claim 8 is contains essentially the same limitations as claim 1 above and is thus rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 9 is contains essentially the same limitations as claim 3 above and is thus rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 10 is contains essentially the same limitations as claim 4 above and is thus rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 11 is contains essentially the same limitations as claim 5 above and is thus rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 12 is contains essentially the same limitations as claim 6 above and is thus rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 13 is contains essentially the same limitations as claim 7 above and is thus rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 14 is contains essentially the same limitations as claim 1 above and is thus rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 15 is contains essentially the same limitations as claim 6 above and is thus rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is contains essentially the same limitations as claim 3 above and is thus rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 17 is contains essentially the same limitations as claim 7 above and is thus rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is contains essentially the same limitations as claim 8 above and is thus rejected under similar rationale.

6. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Nelson and Getchius further in view of Conner et al (USPN: 6718515).

Nelson in view of Getchius teach claim 1 however, Nelson and Getchius do not explicitly indicate wherein a runtime extension is selected to create the executable class file based upon a file extension associated with the request.

Conner et al teaches a runtime extension is selected to create the executable class file based upon a file extension associated with the request. More specifically, a .jsp extension calls the reusable components of JAVA (fig 2, col 4 line 59 to col 5, line 9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Conner et al into those of Nelson in order to make the system efficient. By being able to determine the runtime extension based upon the file extension of a request for content, a system would simply reference the file extension in treating the content requests.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Asad M. Nawaz whose telephone number is (571) 272-3988. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AMN



SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER